

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 03/18/2003

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/716,708	11/20/2000	Wolfgang Siebert	SIEBERT ET AL 2	6782	
75	90 03/18/2003				
COLLARD & ROE, P.C.			EXAMI	EXAMINER	
1077 Northern Boulevard Roslyn, NY 11576			RAO, SHRI	RAO, SHRINIVAS H	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2814	<u>-</u>	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/716,708	SIEBERT ET AL.	
Advisory Addistr	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Steven H. Rao	2814	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 17 March 2003 FAILS TO PLACE TO Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applicated abandonment of this applicated amendment which	ation. A proper repl h places the applica	y to a ation in
	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of 8 (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount of the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the main	g date of the final rejecting FINAL REJECTION. R 1.136(a) and the approper of the fee. The appropriationally set in the final	ion. See MPEP ropriate extension ropriate extension Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) \square they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or si	mplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancellNOTE:	ng a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claim	S.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejecti	on(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed	amendment
 5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ requesting the application in condition for allowance becaused by the Examiner in the final rejection. 	ecause: See Continuation Sheet.		•
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we	, <i>, ,</i>		and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	_		/)
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is		· /	ner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer 10. Other:	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	The Consey	
	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	RY PRIMARY EX LOGY CENTER	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants' have not cancelled non-elected claims. Applicants' arguments that the teachings of applied references, particularly Krishna, should be limited to its preferred embodiments is not persuasive because the current law is that all parts of a prior art reference is applicable as prior art and the teachings should not be limited to preferred embodiments only. Krishna as admitted by the applicants' in page 4 line 34 describes a surface roughness that can be no greater than 1.0 nm Ra. which range includes surface roughness of 0.001 to .10 mn Ra that overlaps the recited range of 0.05 to 0.29 nm Ra and without a showing of criticality or unexpected results in obvious in view of the prior art teachings overlapping range.

SUPERVISORY PRIMARY EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800